Inside Story: Why Brownell Is Attacking Harry Cain for "Bias," See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. III, NO. 45 NOVEMBER 28.1955 101 WASHINGTON D. C. 15 CENTS

The Real Question Raised by Murray's Proposal for An H-Bomb Demonstration:

Is National Suicide A Sensible Form of Defense?

The real reason Washington rejects Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray's proposal for a world H-bomb demonstration is not for fear of what it might do to Them but for fear of what it might do to Us. The basic decisions of atomic warfare have been made from the beginning without consulting public opinion. At first from necessity and later from considerations of military security and finally from fear and habit, atomic decisions have been and are being made in secret, without popular consultation.

Democratic processes have been one of the first victims of nuclear fission. The decision to try and make the bomb and the decision to drop it on Japan were, of course, made privately. So was the decision to go ahead and make the H-bomb; had it not been for a slip by former Senator Ed Johnson of Colorado the public would never have known of it. Finally the decision to use "tactical" atomic weapons, and to refashion the armed services for atomic warfare, has also been made by the inner circles of the government without debate in Congress or elsewhere. The current Sagebrush military maneuvers in Louisiana show how far that transformation has gone. (See the very perceptive dispatch from Fort Polk by Mark S. Watson, ablest of the Pentagon military correspondents, in last Sunday's Nov. 20 *Baltimore Sun*).

The atomic thunderbolt is no longer a final weapon to be held in reserve for use only under the gravest circumstances on Presidential decision, but *the* weapon around which all our military planning and training now revolve. Though atomic warfare mean national suicide and humanity's final holocaust, the decision to engage in it has been made. We have been consulted as little about it as if we lived under a dictatorship.

Our New National Religion

Only once has there been a great national debate on atomic policy and that came when the aroused atomic scientists descended on Washington like a flock of Paul Reveres to raise the alarums against military control of atomic energy. That great debate, right after the war, was made possible because (1) Congress had to be consulted if an atomic energy act were to be passed, and (2) the atomic scientists had not yet been frightened away from political activity by the loyalty-security mania. In this case political activity meant an attempt to fulfill the highest moral responsibilities in the society to which they had made so fatal a gift. But that was before the onset of the cold war, and since that time the government has succeeded by one means or another in shutting off real debate.

Every attempt by the Russians from the Stockholm peace petition to the latest Molotov proposals for a world pledge against atomic warfare has been hooted down. Discussion of foreign policy has been made to seem somehow unpatriotic; talk of peace suspect. Mr. Acheson's call for "total diplomacy" in January, 1950, merely put this into a vivid and sinister phrase; it sought at home the same kind of "disciplined" attitude toward foreign policy on which dictatorships pride themselves. Oppenheimer's ordeal, of which the atomic scientists knew long before the public, provided the scientific elite with a chilling object lesson. The decisions were to be made by our "betters"—though these self appointed "betters" included some of those Generals with prognathous jaws and Neanderthal minds who adorn the covers of our news weeklies and wield the power of world life and death through our ever-ready Strategic Air Command. The reality has been the subordination of the best scientific minds to military control through the rich carrot of military research grants and the heavy stick of possible loyalty proceedings. In a period when no General ever makes a speech anymore without giving God a plug, and self-righteous moralizings ooze from every political pore, real morality has been completely abandoned in our imbecile fascination with these new destructive toys. The atom is our totem; the Bomb our Moloch; faith in overwhelming force is being made into our real national religion.

Public Debate Feared

The Pentagon and State Department have feared public debate lest it interfere with the task of recasting our armed forces, our moral standards and our minds. There is evidence that this remolding process is far from complete and irreversible. The latest Gallup poll which shows that peace far outranks every other problem in the public mind (42 percent answered peace —the farm problem which was next, drew only 8 percent). To hold an H-bomb demonstration in the Pacific, as Mr. Murray proposes, with the world press and all other governments represented, would be not merely to frighten Them but to awaken Us out of our lethargy.

Thanks to Mr. Murray, we are now authoritatively warned that the atmospheric and soil contamination from large thermonuclear explosions is a far graver menace than had hitherto been supposed; apparently there is a limit to the safe amount of thermonuclear explosions even without war. A new substance, radioactive strontium, not hitherto present in the air or earth, has been created and released. Its contamination continues long after the blasts. As it passes from the soil into food and the human body, it can create bone tumors and fatal effects. Commissioner Murray says that estimates of how much radioactive strontium can safely be absorbed "have changed almost wildly" in the past year. A year ago it was said that we had little to fear because the amount would have to increase by 1,000,000 times; now the estimate has been reduced to 10,000 times. Mr. Murray thinks this figure will be lowered. His four fellow Commissioners in rejecting his proposal for an H-bomb demonstration,

(*Continued on Page Four*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brownell Opens Up on The Witch Hunter Who Turned Against The Witch Hunt

The Real Story Behind The Attack on Harry Cain for "Bias"

For transparency it would be hard to match the attack which the Department of Justice has just launched against former Senator Harry Cain for "bias." A certain kind of bias has been the prime requisite for appointment to the Subversive Activities Control Board. When Truman tried to put one lone liberal on it, Charles M. La Follette, the FBI and the Congressional witch hunters ganged up and prevented his confirmation. The Board has been the exclusive preserve of rightists, and Cain's main qualification for membership when Eisenhower named him to it in 1953 was his outspoken adherence to McCarthyite doctrine.

In the past two years, thanks to personal contact with security cases and an awakened conscience, Cain has become the maverick of the SACB, the gadfly of the Administration on loyalty probe abuses and a crusader against the Attorney General's list and anonymous informants. Nevertheless, when the Attorney General last winter petitioned the SACB to declare the Washington Pension Union a Communist front and Cain was assigned to the case, defense counsel filed the same kind of general motion to disqualify against Cain that the first accused Communist fronts had made in 1953. The Department of Justice defended Cain's impartiality at the argument on this motion, which was denied last March.

Echo of the Wallgren Fight

At that time no specific allegations of bias against the Pension Union were made. But when the hearings opened October 3 in Seattle, J. G. Sykes, counsel for the Pension Union, asked an off the record sidebar conference with Cain and Posey Kime, the government attorney. Sykes said his client had discovered that in opposing the nomination of former Senator Mon C. Wallgren in 1949 to be chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Cain had called the Washington Pension Union "a notorious Communist front." At the conclusion of the conference, however, Sykes declared himself satisfied that Cain could give the Union a fair hearing.

The government agreed and presented its case, which was completed on October 19. It was not until November 9, after the defense had begun to put in its evidence, that William F. Tompkins, Brownell's Assistant Attorney General for internal security, opened his attack on Cain for "bias" against the Washington Pension Union as evidenced by his statement in 1949. By that time it was the general consensus of opinion in the Seattle press (1) that Cain had been presiding over the hearings with admirable fairness* and (2) that the case was going badly for the government. Mishaps had occurred during the parade of informers; one of them had sued a Seattle paper for calling him a Communist, an accusation he denied under oath; now he turned up as an admitted ex-Communist to testify against the Pension Union.

Evidence on the Crucial Point

More serious was Cain's ruling, over the government's objections, allowing the Washington Pension Union to introduce a mass of its statements and literature as evidence of its activities. This was admitted in pursuance of Section 13(f) 3 of the Internal Security Act which says that the Board in deciding whether an organization is a Communist front shall take into consideration "the extent to which its funds, resources or personnel are used to further or promote the objectives of any Communist action organization, Communist foreign government or the world Communist movement." The literature turned out to deal largely with the fight for higher pensions, and little else.

It was at this point that the Department decided to ask for Cain's disqualification. Its campaign, though well larded with assertions of a high ethical duty to the accused, opened with a serious misstatement. In a letter to Chairman Herbert of the SACB, Tompkins claimed that in the sidebar conference of October 8 Sykes, after expressing his own confidence in Cain, had added that a motion to disqualify "might be made at a later date if the organization [i.e. the Washington Pension Union] should insist."

Invitation Rejected

When the Tompkins letter was read, Cain asked those who participated in the October 8 conference to state their recollection on the point. He said he himself remembered no such statement. Kime, the government attorney, was significantly silent and failed to support Tompkins. Sykes denied he had said any such thing. He declared that if the Tompkins letter was an invitation to file a motion to disqualify "we reject the invitation." "We have never made a motion to disqualify Board Member Cain," Sykes said, "and we will not make a motion to disqualify Board Member Cain."

On November 22 the Department of Justice filed a formal petition in Seattle and Washington asking Cain's disqualification, and the hearings were thereupon suspended for two weeks. But this time Tompkins and Brownell added another charge—of "bias" on the other side. It asked the Board to "take judicial notice" of an article by Cain in the November issue of *Coronet*, of the friendly way Cain characterized the Pension Union in it, and of his story about championing a former WPU member named Smiley. [See box on next page.] The petition says Smiley "is believed to be the pseudonym of Vernon Todd Riley." Riley was one of those named as a Communist by the government's star witness, Mrs. Barbara Hartle, who has become an informer since her conviction under the Smith Act as a leading State of Washington Communist. The implication is that Cain is "biased" for the Union and against the government's principal informer because he championed one of her victims.

Tactics of Desperation

In any ordinary law-suit, a motion to disqualify under the circumstances in this case would be thrown out as highly irregular. Only a fear of losing the case and hatred of Cain can explain the desperate foolhardiness of the Department. The Washington Pension Union was once a political power. It had 30,000 members and it gave Washington the highest pensions in the country. Its ex-members are threatened with blacklisting for many types of employment because the Union is on the Attorney General's list. Were Cain to rule the Union was not a Communist front, this would lift the shadow of the security-loyalty program from them.

In addition there are thousands of defense and maritime workers in Washington State who have an interest in fighting the security hysteria. Cain is already a hero to many of them. The witch hunter who turned against the witch hunt would make a powerful candidate next Fall for the Senate against Magnuson, the liberal who fathered the illiberal legislation for screening maritime workers. Cain's term on the SACB expires in August and he will never be reappointed if Brownell has his way. The effect of this new attack, however, may serve to put Cain back in the Senate, where he would be all the more effective as our No. 1 Republican critic of security abuses.

* The Seattle Times: "Cain's fair and judicious conduct of the Pension Union hearings has made an excellent impression in Seattle—one that lends weight to his views on questions of Federal security procedure."

Why Overburden Santa's Reindeers?

Lighten their load—and yours. Solve your Xmas problem by sending that friend a gift subscription to the Weekly. Just use the coupon on page four and write across it, "Please send Christmas gift card with it."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Quick Glance at the Main Fronts: Stevenson Starts Off With Bromides

And When Will Harriman Stop Pretending He's A Robespierre?

Political Front: Stevenson's opener was a bore. The last thing one expected from Adlai were after dinner bromides. And we wish Harriman would stop acting as if he were a Robespierre. Just because he's a multimillionaire is no reason why he should be so fiercely anti "moderate." The one thing evident from the Chicago speeches is that the Democrats are not disposed to challenge the Republicans either on German or Chinese policy, and have nothing more to offer than intensification of the cold war.

Aftermath of Geneva: The first Geneva meeting was a defeat for the Germans: it relaxed tension while leaving the Reich defeated. The second Geneva meeting, thanks to Mr. Dulles, was a German victory: the Russians must now deal directly with the Germans in order to achieve any relaxation of international tension and disarmament. . . . The weakness of Dulles' (and their) position is that it (1) overestimates Russian internal strains and (2) underestimates the benefits the Russians draw from a split Reich, particularly in supplies and machine tools from East Germany. Meantime many West Germans are displeased because the U.S. did not offer to swap free elections and a neutral Reich for reunification. . . . Perhaps we were afraid the Russians might accept. . . .

Civil Liberties Front: The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee won a victory of historic importance for all draftees when Federal Judge Edelstein ruled in New York that the Army could not give less than honorable discharges because of pre-induction activities deemed disloyal or subversive. But the Army's revision of the discharge rules under pressure from the Hennings committee is still equivocal. . . . The ECLC's own counsel, Leonard Boudin, won half a victory when Judge Youngdahl ruled that the State Department could not refuse him a passport without a hearing at which adverse evidence had to be disclosed. But at the same time the Judge held that State Department might make "reasonable regulations" restricting the "right" to travel. A right which can be restricted so easily is not much of a right. . . . The Supreme Court has rarely heard more inflammatory nonsense than from the State Attorneys General in the Nelson case; one would think from their presentation that without sedition laws the states could not punish disorderly conduct, riotous assembly, destruction of property and arson. . . . Questions from the bench during argument of the Communist registration case against the SACB seemed to indicate that Chief Justice Warren was concerned about the "buckshot" character of registration, affecting legal as well as illegal activities, while Mr. Justice Frankfurter indicated concern about the innocent and idealistic drawn into Communist association. . . .

Middle East Front: Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Sharrett, who grows more skilful with the years, had to deal with an unusually hostile and unsympathetic (sometimes almost anti-Jewish) barrage of questions at the National Press Club last Monday. . . . The State Department is throwing all its weight behind the Eden plan to make peace at the expense of Israel. Cairo welcomes the Eden proposals because a truncated Israel could more easily be attacked on the next round. Dulles' remark about territory with only "sentimental" value seems to have echoed Nasser's proposals last year to make peace if given a large slice of the Negev. But the oil, minerals and challenge of the Negev have more than sentimental value for Israel. . . . Both sides are now playing up to the Arabs, and there has been a disturbing increase in anti-Zionist agitation in the satellite States. . . . One of the side-rivalries in the Middle East is reflected in the "little war" being waged over the oil rich Buraimi desert between (American backed) Saudi Arabia and a (British backed) independent Sheikh for the right to exploit that disputed area. That "suppressed" story to which we called attention last week was bigger than the AP reported: the *London Mail* of November 7 and 8 not only reported that Aramco funds financed the Czech-Egyptian arms deal but also said, "American money goes even further afield. The Saudis, who live by bribery, virtually control the Syrian Parliament and half the Parliament of Lebanon." . . .

Jolly Fellow, Comrade Krushchev And (Just Like Beria) Quite A Civil Libertarian

"Mr. Pearson retorted that every Communist party organization in the West was a Soviet base. That was a domestic problem for individual countries, Mr. Krushchev replied, adding, 'Why not liquidate them, or put the members in concentration camps?'"

—Account from Ottawa of Canadian Foreign Minister Lester Pearson's recent visit with Krushchev, New York Times, November 20.

If A Scientist Works on Cancer, What Difference Does His Politics Make?

This, Too, Is Cited As Evidence of "Bias" By The Justice Department

"Our exaggerated fear of Communist infiltration had become a plague. It led brother to spy on brother, as in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. It broke the lives of many decent people, who, in a number of cases, were convicted by malicious rumor, plain dirty lies and the words of professional informers. . . . It blacklisted actors and artists. It drove teachers from their classrooms, defense workers from the shops. . . .

". . . It was the visit of Mrs. Smiley that got me started. She came to my office and begged me to listen. . . . She told me her husband, a government scientist at work doing cancer research, had been suspended from his job. Unknown accusers had charged that Smiley had been a Communist Party organizer in the state of Washington in the 1930's. . . .

"I asked, 'What in the blazes difference does it make if he had been a Communist or a Hottentot, if he is combatting a disease that strikes all men?' I had to answer that question myself. With my background, it was a pretty tough one for me to face. I had to admit it did not make the slightest difference what Smiley's politics had been, unless it had been clearly established that he had been working against the U. S. . . .

"Smiley and his wife married in college. The time was the depression with its breadlines and bank failures. Mrs. Smiley joined an outfit called the Washington Pension Union because it worked for free milk and pensions. Occasional meetings were held at Smiley's home. . . . Some years after the Smileys were out of the Pension Union, it was placed on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. Then, years later, nameless voices accused Smiley of being a Communist organizer.

"Smiley asked me, 'How can I prove I was not a Communist? I don't even know who made the charge, or under what circumstances he considered me a Communist.'

"I read through the hearings on Smiley, and I appeared at one session. . . . The security board was more concerned with what anonymous accusers said that Smiley had been in the long ago than with his ten years of faithful Federal service.

"I knew then that I could not remain silent and live with myself."

—Former Senator Harry Cain, "I Could Not Remain Silent," (As Told to Tris Coffin) in Coronet for November.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Operation Sagebrush Shows An Aggressor Can Jam Our Radar Defenses

The Ultimate Delusion of the Atomic Age

(*Continued from Page One*)

significantly fail to deny these figures. Their official statement merely says that until further study has been made "it is impossible to be definite about the genetic effects." To say that it is impossible as yet to be definite is quite different from the statements of a year ago that fear of radioactive fallout was exaggerated. Why should these matters be cloaked in secrecy, the decisions on them made without popular discussion?

The Fallacies of Atomic War

The lack of real debate has allowed a thick deposit of dubious ideological fall-out to contaminate the public mind. A whole series of doubtful propositions have been rubbed in by official statement and their echoes in a well-coordinated press. There is first of all the notion that but for the bomb the Russians would have overrun Western Europe after the war. This is highly doubtful in view of the terrible wounds they still had to heal from the last war; the enormous headaches occupation of Western Europe would have added to their problems, the civil war it would have provoked and the world war it would have unleashed.

America has twice been plunged into world war unprepared, and twice won despite that initial handicap. The Russians are not fools; they do not underestimate the huge industrial capacity and human resources of the American people. It is, I believe, the most dreadful nonsense to say that they would have overrun Western Europe if we had not had the bomb. The same is true, in my opinion, of the equally prevalent notion that there would be world war today but for fear of our bombs. The Russians and the Chinese have enough to do at home; and even without the bomb, war with America would ruin them for a generation. Then there is the newer notion that we must not give up nuclear warfare because only The Bomb counterbalances the "hordes" at the disposal of Russia and China. But this completely overlooks the fact that these "hordes" now have the A-bomb and the H-bomb, too. So we no longer have an advantage. Would it not be better for both sides to see if some means cannot be found to ban nuclear warfare for humanity's good?

In the past, certain terrible weapons have been held in reverse by both sides, and neither have used it; poison gas is an example. It is one thing to have the bomb in reserve. It is quite another to equip whole armies with atomic weapons so that they are no longer able to fight any other kind of war. That is what we are doing. We are thus deciding in advance that a new war shall be a war without mercy and limit. The notion that atomic war can be limited; that atomic weapons can be used, as Eisenhower once said, like "pistols," fosters the most dangerous misconceptions. Once such a war begins, neither side dares hold back its worst and biggest bombs, though this may mean total mutual destruction.

Nightmarish Consolation

Atomic war means national suicide. The ultimate delusion of the atomic era is the notion that national suicide is a feasible means of defense; how apparently sensible and sane men could drift into such beliefs will astound future historians, if there are any. All this has been underscored by the Sagebrush maneuvers. They have shown how easily radar defenses can be jammed by an attacking air fleet; we can wreck Russia's cities but Russia can wreck ours. And the whole human race may be ruined by the after effects. Is it not irrational, then, to decide for atomic warfare when atomic warfare means mutual suicide? Should such a decision be made without the fullest national and world debate? How much security is there in plans for defense which could do no more than assure our dying people that the enemy was dying, too? The Strategic Air Command can destroy the enemy, but it cannot defend us.

To set off on the path of atomic warfare is to set off on a path from which there is no return, toward a goal where there can be no victory, into a hell where none could survive. Until now the worst wars have been, to some extent, limited—if not by human intention and hatred, then at least by human capacity to destroy. But this war, the war we have been trying out in Operation Sagebrush, the atomic war must become unlimited war, against Us as well as Them. On those whom the bombs spare the radioactive dusts will fall, gently and impartially as the rain.

We Believe This Deserves Wide Circulation—Order in Bulk or Let Us Send Copies to Your Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

* extra for Canada. 11/28/55

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED